



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
ASSISTANT CHIEF OF STAFF FOR INSTALLATION MANAGEMENT
600 ARMY PENTAGON
WASHINGTON DC 20310-0800

DAIM-ZA

OCT 20 2003


MEMORANDUM FOR

DIRECTOR INSTALLATION MANAGEMENT AGENCY, ATTN: SFIM-ZA, 2511
JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY, ARLINGTON, VA 22202-3926

DIRECTOR MILITARY PROGRAMS, HEADQUARTERS US ARMY CORPS OF
ENGINEERS, 441 G STREET NW, WASHINGTON, DC 20314-1000

SUBJECT: Army Facility Standardization Committee

1. The Army Facility Standardization Committee (AFSC) action on 29 September 2003 to approve a new committee process is a positive step forward for the Army to improve how we set facility standards. A Memorandum for Record of the committee meeting is attached.
2. The future committee actions should focus on improving both the function and appearance of our installations. The Army Facility Standardization Sub-Committee of SES level is working on the details of the process, a charter, resources needed, and where funding is available. The next AFSC meeting is scheduled for 1000-1130 on 21 January 2004 in the ACSIM Pentagon Conference Room 3E474.
3. Appreciate the team effort to make this the best process possible for the Army. The ACSIM POC for the AFSC and the Sub-Committee is Mr. Larry Black, DAIM-FDF, (703) 428-6173.


LARRY J. LUST
Major General, GS
Assistant Chief of Staff
for Installation Management

Encl

CF:
DAIM-FD
DAS(I&H)

INFORMATION PAPER

DAIM-FD
07 October 2003

SUBJECT: Army Facility Standardization Committee

1. Purpose: To provide the minutes of the Army Facility Standardization Committee meeting of 29 September 2003. Attendance list and briefing charts are attached.
2. Minutes of meeting:
 - a. Purpose of meeting:
 - (1) Obtain approval of the revised Army Standardization Process and Standard Design for Chapel.
 - (2) Provide updates to the Committee on General Instructional Buildings, Company Operations Facility, and Army Installation Design Standards.
 - (3) Lay out a way ahead for the next meeting.
 - b. Actions Taken:
 - (1) Approved new Army Standardization Process.
 - (2) Disapproved Chapel Standard Design.
 - (3) Approved recommendation to combine General Instruction Building criteria with Army Continuing Education System criteria. Will submit Army Standard for January 2004 approval.
 - (4) Mr. Nerger, DAIM-FD, was tasked to lead an SES team of Mr. Beranek, USACE, Mr. Sakowitz, IMA, and himself review the approved Standardization Process to identify staffing, organizational charters, and resource requirements, and make appropriate recommendations to MG Lust on fully implementing the Army Facility Standardization Process.
 - c. Issues discussed:
 - (1) Responsibility to Enforce Application of Army Standards and Standard Designs that are developed through the Standardization Process:
 - USACE can ensure compliance with Army Standards in design phase through the Facility Centers of Standardization.
 - Compliance to Army Standards at each installation is the responsibility of both the installation's Director Public Works and Garrison Commander.
 - (2) MG Johnson pointed out USACE is not funded for technology transfer. MG Lust asked IMA to identify installations to test technology and standards. ACSIM John Nerger, DAIM-FD has the lead to identify funds for Technology Standards Group technology transfer as a part of his resource review for the Standardization Process.
 - d. LTC (Chaplain) Richardson, representing the HQDA proponent for chapels, the Army Chief of Chaplains, presented chapel Standard Design with input from Rich Lewis,

Omaha District, Center of Standardization of chapels. Comments included:

- (1) MG Lust and MG Aadland asked for the design to avoid flat roofs.
- (2) MG Aadland asked if any kind of force protection was included in design.
- (3) Landscaping shown does not appear to meet requirements.
- (4) Parking near building is controlled for weddings and funerals by use of removal bollards, but it is not on the standard design.
- (5) MG Lust asked for the formula to take installation population and determine number of seats in a chapel. Chaplain will provide formula.
- (6) MG Aadland stated, "The chapel design had no aesthetics." It looks like a bank, not a chapel. Appearance must be improved.
- (7) Design elevations did not show windows or stain glass. The use of day lighting for sustainability must be included. Control of light in worship center can be accomplished with controls.
- (8) MG Lust asked for manual controls on movable partitions to avoid failure when electric power is off.
- (9) The Chapel Design Team is to develop both a revised Standard Design for Chapels and criteria for submission as the Army Standards for Chapels. Actions are to be submitted at the next meeting of the Standardization Committee.

e. MS Wendy Schmidt, DAIM-FDC, presented an update on the activities of the Design Team for General Instructional Buildings. She recommended that the Committee combine General Instruction Building criteria with Army Continuing Education System criteria. The Committee approved.

f. Mr. Tom Broadbank, HQUSACE, presented an update on the activities of the Design Team for Company Operations Facility (COF).

- (1) MG Aadland asked that the standard design be submitted to all regions.
- (2) MG Lust asked for design to include space for storage of weapon cleaning supplies and floors to resist cleaning chemicals.
- (3) The Design Team will complete the Standard Design for COF and develop the proposed Army Standard COF to be submitted for approval to the Standardization Committee.

g. Army Installation Design Standards (IDS) detailed update will be rescheduled for MG Lust and MG Aadland at a later date. Brief comments included:

- (1) DAIM-FDF is working revisions to IDS for approval by future Army Facility Standardization Committee.
- (2) MG Aadland concurred in development of all Installation Design Guides to comply with the Installation Design Standards in FY04-05. Requires IMA funding \$12.5M each year.

h. General Comments by MG Lust, ACSIM:

- (1) Future committee meetings every 90 days. Need to have items to vote on up front on agenda. Bring things for "yes" or "no" vote.
- (2) Looking for how to make installations better, to get a common feel across

all of the Army installations.

- (3) Things have changed with the creation of IMA to ensure one Army corporate view. We now have one Director IMA to get facilities management focused.
- (4) We have standards, some on paper and some not. We will continue to work to get on paper.

i. General comment by MG Aadland, Director IMA:

- (1) The Current Standardization Process identified on Chart #6 needs to be changed from "Relies on" to "Relied on." A change is needed for other items on this chart to also read past tense to reflect that the revised process is now in place.
- (2) We need to work staffing and resource the process, but the tone is set.

j. General comments by MG Johnson, Chief of Military Programs:

- (1) USACE is fully supportive of the revised standardization process.
- (2) We have to decide what are the things we really want to be immutable Army Standards. Deviation from the industry standards requires we identify costs and know impacts. MG Johnson offered the example of using bullnose corners inside buildings to reduce damage. However, to make this an Army Standard should require we determine the cost to install and maintain.

3. Next events:

- a. Technology Standards Group and Facilities Design Group both scheduled to meet monthly starting in October 2003.
- b. SES Sub-committee meets quarterly starting in December 2003.
- c. Committee to meet quarterly starting 1000-1130 on 21 January 2004.

Approved by John Nerger
Director, Facilities and Housing
Date: 7 October 2003

Encl
as